DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 087 TM 008 457

AUTHOR Finkler, Deana; Leach, Marilyn
TITLE Assessment of a University Instructional Evaluation System by Student Consumers.
PUB DATE [Mar 78]
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Teachers; *Course Evaluation; *Enrollment Influences; Higher Education; *Information Utilization; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Needs; *Test Results; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS University of Nebraska Omaha

ABSTRACT

In order to evaluate the format and use of the instructor evaluation instrument at the University of Nebraska, Omaha, an urban commuter campus, 1,238 undergraduates answered a 31-item questionnaire. Results indicated that students' choices of classes were largely dictated by requirements of their major and by their work schedules. The six most significant sources of information which influenced course decisions were in order of importance; (1) class schedule; (2) previous experience with a professor; (3) friend's recommendation; (4) course description; (5) faculty recommendation; and (6) instructor evaluation. It was concluded that the current instructor evaluation form was not serving the needs of the student body. Samples of the instructor evaluation form and the student survey on instructor evaluation, as well as survey results, are appended. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169087

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Assessment of a University Instructional Evaluation System by Student Consumers

Deana Finkler[1]
University of Nebraska

Marilyn Leach[2]
University of Nebraska at Omaha

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Deana Finkler
Marilyn Leach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Printed in U.S.A.

[1]Research Psychologist, Academic Affairs, Regents' Hall, University of Nebraska, 3835 Holdrege, Lincoln, NE 68583.

[2]Coordinator, Center for the Improvement of Instruction, University of Nebraska at Omaha, P. O. Box 688, Omaha, NE 68101.

TM008 457

Session 18 16

Abstract

A survey of 1,238 university students concerning their use of published instructor evaluations, considerations in course decisions, preferred evaluation content and format, and procedures and judgments identified that the existing twenty-item evaluation instrument did not meet their needs. Students rated information describing academic aspects of the classroom as more important for making course decisions than interactional or workload aspects, but their ability to choose courses freely was found to be severely limited by the requirements of their major and by their work schedules.

Assessment of a University Instructional Evaluation System by Student Consumers

The heated debates of the last decade over the use of student evaluation of instruction in higher education have mellowed and there is now widespread commitment to it in both principle and practice (A.A.U.P., 1975; Seldin, 1975). Today's issues concerning student evaluation engage a sophisticated set of topics such as what students can evaluate reliably (Costin, Greenough, & Menges, 1971; Grush, & Costin, 1975), what types of instruments and settings provide valid indices of teaching excellence (Bryson, 1974; Doyle, & Whitley, 1974; McKeachie, & Lin, 1975), and how such information can best be used (Centra, 1973; French-Lazovik; McIntyre, Seibert, & Owens, 1977; Miller, 1972; Sheehan, 1975; Thorne, 1976).

Two purposes of instructional evaluation dominate the literature--evaluation to aid faculty development and for administrative decision making. Only rarely is the third purpose of providing information to student consumers mentioned (McIntyre, et al., 1977; Stark, 1976). Recognition of students as a major force creating instructional change (Cross, 1976) and of increasing federal requirements for full disclosure to consumers (Stark, 1976) suggests that we must begin to explore the informational needs of students in the classroom. The survey reported here is one such effort.

Morstain and Gaff (1977) argue that faculty and students are in partnership in the teaching-learning process and that student input about instruction can benefit faculty development programs by helping them

respond to what students see as important. In their survey, students are described as seeking "revitalization" of their educational experience. It is difficult to see how this may be accomplished without providing students information describing campus and classroom activities so that they may seek out learning environments and experiences important to them. At least two federal projects are exploring ways of providing such information and of helping students become more sophisticated consumers (e.g., National Project I, "Better Information for Student Choice," and the University of Nebraska F,I,P.S.E. Project "Helping Students Become More Sophisticated Consumers of Their Own Education.")

In the fall, 1976, the University of Nebraska at Omaha decided to evaluate the format and use of their instructor evaluation instrument, a third-generation 20-item unifactor rating form presented in Table 1. The administration requires that this form be used to evaluate each course every semester. Results are returned to faculty for personal development, department and university norms are generated for administrative use, and item-by-item distributions for each course are published periodically by the Student Senate. Publication requires written approval by each professor listed. A committee of representative faculty and students developed the evaluation plan which included surveys of all three consumer groups. The results of the student survey are reported here.

Insert Table 1 about here

Method

Procedure and Data Source

A thirty-one item questionnaire designed to reflect student use of instructor evaluations, considerations in course decisions, preferred content and format, procedures and judgments, and demographic information was developed by a joint faculty-student committee (see Table 2). It was administered in the first week of the spring semester, 1977, immediately following general registration to a five percent random sample of undergraduate classes stratified proportionally across seven colleges and four class levels on the basis of course listings in the spring class schedule.

Insert Table 2 about here

Questionnaires were delivered to the instructors of the classes drawn for the sample. A cover letter requested their cooperation and explained the administration and data collection procedures. A similar letter addressed to students was attached to each questionnaire. Students were also asked to complete only one questionnaire. Completed questionnaires were delivered to the Center for the Improvement of Instruction for processing.

Sixty-nine percent of the classes participated for a total sample of 54 classes and 1,238 respondents. Table 3 presents the class return rates by college and course level.

Insert Table 3 about here

Student Access to Published Evaluations

At the time of the survey, evaluations had not been published for two semesters and only a limited number of copies of past evaluations were available in central locations and at registration. This limit on student access was particularly severe for new and transfer students who might not know that the evaluations were available. The Office of Admissions estimates that fifty percent of the spring, 1977, undergraduate registrants were new or transfer students who were not enrolled during the previous spring semester when the evaluations were last published.

Results

Student Descriptions

A summary of responses to the survey questionnaire tabulated across all 1,238 respondents is presented in Table 4. Included in Section II of the survey are self-descriptions by the students indicating that the sample is adequately representative of the U.N.O. undergraduate population. U.N.O. is an urban commuter campus whose students are older, more likely to be employed, and to attend college on a part-time basis than students at more traditional residential colleges and universities.

Insert Table 4 about here

Student Attentiveness

A common concern for student evaluations involves the degree to which students attended to the questions. A random response pattern would be one indicator of lack of attentiveness. The appropriate Chi-Square or Analysis of Variance tests performed on the response distribution to each item in Section I of the survey indicate only three statistically non-significant results using $p \leq .05$ as the criterion (i.e., items A_1, Q, and R). Items H and I were statistically significant at $p < .05$, all others were significant at $p < .01$. Given the large number of items with non-randomly distributed response patterns, it is reasonable to assume the students attended to the questions asked. Three additional observations support this conclusion. First, the high rate of response by faculty taking class time to administer the survey and second, the lack of negative student feedback suggest that the questionnaire was perceived as both relevant and coherent and thus met the participants' criteria for face validity. Third, inspection of item response patterns and contingencies across items demonstrates consistency across similar or related items. In addition, the number of instances where a student failed to respond to one or more items was negligible.

Survey Responses

The results reported below and presented in Table 4 are based on all students responding to each item without correction for missing data. Note that the statistical tests referred to above also establish the statistical significance of the results reported in the following sections.

Use and consideration in course decisions. More students felt that instructor evaluations were used for instructor self-improvement (48%)

and administrative decision making (37%) than for student course selection (30%). In the top three of five response categories reflecting importance placed on instructor evaluations (1 = unimportant, 3 = important, 5 = very important), more students perceived administrators as valuing the results (63%), then faculty (58%), with fewer students themselves placing importance on evaluations (48%), and slightly fewer perceiving other students as doing so (44%).

Only six percent of the students reported using the published evaluations as an aid to course or instructor selection for the current semester. It is surprising that these seventy-four students sought out the evaluations without any publicity concerning their existence or location. Only 19% of the students reported having used the evaluations as an aid to course or instructor selection in previous semesters. Of the 20% of the students who reported having used the evalutions to confirm personal experience with a course or instructor after the fact, 38% said that the evaluations did not include the kind of information they sought and 57% reported that they felt the ratings were inaccurate. Note that in previous semesters, approximately the same number of students had used the evaluations to choose courses or instructors as had used them to confirm experiences after the fact. Since only half (9.8%) reported using evaluations for both purposes, approximately 29% of the students have used the published evaluations for some purpose in previous semesters. This is not surprising given the large percentage of new and transfer students in the student body who did not have previous access to the evaluations.

Although less than 30% of the students said that they had ever used the evaluations, 59% of them said that the format of the published evaluations

was understandable and readable. These responses appear to be contradictory. Some students, however, may have had previous access to the evaluations or seen older ones at registration, but not used them for decision making or confirming experiences; others may have been referring to the format of the evaluation form rather than to the publication of the evaluation results.

A majority of the students (54%) felt that student funds should not be used to publish the evaluations but 65% of the student respondents said that they would use them if copies were available in the library and student center. These results are understandable on an urban commuter campus where [illegible]% of the students reported that over 50% of their class choices were predetermined by their major and 45% of them indicated that their work schedule predetermined over 50% of their class choices. Given the inflexibility that results from these two sources--the course requirements of a major and work schedule demands in light of the courses offered any one semester--it is not surprising that the class schedule is ranked as the most important of six information sources in making course decisions (52% of respondents ranked it the most important source, median of the ranks = 1.5). Medians of the ranks of the other sources were previous experience with a professor (3.2), friend's recommendations (3.2), catalog description (3.3), faculty recommendations (3.8), and teacher evaluations (5.7). Teacher evaluations were ranked as the least important source by 60% of the respondents. Clearly, students feel that they have little choice in making course decisions and that the current instructor evaluation instrument was designed for other's use and does not meet their needs. Their lack of access to current information may also inhibit

current use of the evaluations.

Preferred content and format. Most students (86%) would prefer an evaluation form with twenty or less items and a clear majority of them (61%) would prefer the form to include both descriptive and qualitative judgments of instructor behavior and course conduct. Only 11% of students would limit evaluation to description only and 22% to qualitative judgments only. Six percent felt that students should not evaluate instruction at all.

Students also rated the importance of nineteen types of information for making course decisions. Five items, fairness of tests and grading schemes, interesting course content, interesting instructor, instructor knowledge, and instructor teaching skills were rated in the top two of five response categories of importance by 74% or more of the students. Items such as class size, attendance requirements, amount and difficulty of work, and professor's professional background were least often rated in the top two categories of importance (each $\leq$ 43%) and among those most often rated as unimportant. Items rated in the middle include, from more to less important, course goals, degree of course structure, instructor awareness of individual differences, instructor availability, teaching strategy used, instructor-student rapport, instructor ability to facilitate discussion, equipment availability, performance feedback, and student comments about the course.

Procedures and judgments. Fifty-three percent of the students reported making evaluative ratings on an item-by-item basis whereas 47% were guided by an overall impression of the instructor. A composite item average and instructor teaching skill were identified as the two most

important factors used in determining the summary ratings of an instructor, each by 38% of the respondents. The validity of the evaluation instrument can be questioned on the basis of these results. For some students, the items included on the form determine their overall rating of an instructor, others make their overall rating of an instructor on a more general basis and are not bound by the items included.

Students who rate on an item-by-item basis reported being more careful in making responses than those who use an overall impression to guide their ratings ($p < .01$). Seventy-one percent of the students reported distinguishing between the course and the instructor when making these ratings. Only 7% reported ever having been pressured to evaluate a professor positively or negatively against their own judgment, but when it did occur, the most likely source of that pressure was the professor (40% of those pressured) or other students (30% of those pressured). Fifteen percent of the students reported that the evaluation form is not always administered according to the written procedures ensuring anonymity, direct scoring, and standardization.

Additional Analyses

Statistical comparisons and analyses of the response patterns of students enrolled in eleven colleges, at four class levels (freshmen through senior), and attending U.N.O. part- or full-time were conducted. The results concerning college enrollment are primarily of local interest. Major findings concerning part- or full-time status identified greater restrictions on course choices associated with major requirements and work schedule for part-time as compared to full-time students and fewer experiences for part-time students of being pressured to evaluate a

professor positively or negatively against one's better judgment (all p's $< .05$). Some results of more general interest concerning class level are summarized in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Importance placed on teacher evaluations for making course decisions (Item M) did not vary across class levels although prior and projected use did. Upper division students were more likely than less advanced students to have used the published evaluations for course selection and confirmation of experience (Items D and F), to report that they would seek them out for use if available in a central location (Item J), and to perceive other students as using evaluations for course selection (Item A). They were also more likely than other students to distinguish between the course and the instructor in their own ratings (Item V), although they were less likely to perceive the evaluations as actually used by instructors for self-improvement (Item A). The results also show that the proportion of class choices predetermined by a student's major or work schedule increased with class level (Items K and L).

It is not surprising that experience and academic sophistication are correlated with student reports of seeking and using a broad base of information in decision making, even when decision alternatives are very restricted. It is also possible, however, that upper division students are simply more familiar with the published evaluations than the many lower division students who arrived at U.N.O. after the last publication of the evaluations. Both experience and familiarity are necessary for

thoughtful use of any information source. Upper division students' cynicism concerning the use of evaluations for faculty development may reflect their greater familiarity with the evaluation system as well as a recognition of the inadequacies of the evaluation form.

Conclusions

It is clear that the current instructor evaluation scheme is not serving the needs of the U.N.O. students. There is some question that standardized procedures are being followed and that students feel that their contribution as raters to the evaluation process returns useful and valid information to them. Lack of access to current data and a required unifactor instrument are implicated in their dissatisfaction. The information they seek for making course decisions reflects a real concern for high standards in the teaching-learning process. They do not seek easy courses with few attendance requirements nor do they value instructor-student rapport above instructor knowledge and teaching skills, interesting material and presentation. Their ability to choose courses is severely limited, however, by the requirements of their majors and by their own work schedules. Consistent with the results of this survey, the U.N.O. Student Senate recently voted to cease funding of the publication of the instructor evaluations.

U.N.O.'s courage in exploring the information needs of student consumers should be applauded. They have learned that their current instrument used in a uniform evaluation system does not serve the needs of all its users. Their efforts in developing a uniform system, repeated evaluation of their instrument, student participation in and access to instructor evaluation and to the design of the evaluation study suggest that U.N.O.

may be an institution paritcularly sensitive to student concerns. Redesign of the evaluation instrument to serve student informational needs better and to improve the credibility of the instrument, and a more flexible course scheduling system would facilitate the real purpose of student consumerism, that of helping students optimize their own learning experiences. Additionally, student informational needs might be better served if more complete course descriptions than that available in the catalog were provided. Course syllabi which provide a comprehensive view of course content and evaluation system could be filed in central locations such as the library, student government offices, and department advisors' offices. The student newspaper and campus posters could be used to direct students to these sources during the academic counseling and course registration periods.

References

Statement on teaching evaluation. AAUP Bulletin, Summer, 1975, 200-202.

Bryson, R. Teacher evaluations and student learning: A reexamination. Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 68(1), 12-14.

Centra, J. Effectiveness of student feedback in modifying college instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65(3), 395-401.

Costin, F., Greenough, W. T., & Menges, R. J. Student ratings of college teaching: Reliability, validity, and usefulness. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41(5), 511-535.

Cross, P. The instructional revolution. Invited address, A.A.H.E., Chicago, March, 1976.

Doyle, K. O., & Whitley, S. E. Student ratings as criteria for effective teaching. American Educational Research Journal, 1974, 11(3), 259-274.

French-Lazovik, G. Evaluation of college teaching guidelines for summative and formative evaluation. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges.

Gage, N. L. Student ratings of college teaching: Their justification and proper use. In Aller, Melnik, & Peele (Eds.), Reform, renewal, reward, U. Mass., 1975, 121-135.

Grush, J. E., & Costin, F. The student as consumer of the teaching process. American Educational Research Journal, 1975, 12(1), 55-66.

McIntyre, C. J., Seibert, W., & Owens, R. Evaluation of college teachers. Criteria, 1977, VI, 1-6.

McKeachie, W. J., & Lin, Y-G. Multiple discriminant analysis of student ratings of college teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1975, 68(8), 300-305.

Miller, R. I. Evaluating faculty performance. Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Morstain, B. R., & Gaff, J. Student attitudes toward teaching improvement. PIRIT Newsletter, (3), June 1977, 104.

Seldin, P. How colleges evaluate professors. Blythe-Pennington, Ltd., 1972.

Sheehan, D. S. On the invalidity of student ratings for administrative personnel decisions. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, XLVI(6), 687-700.

Stark, J. S. (Ed.). Promoting consumer protection for students, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Thorne, G. L., Scott, C. S., & Beaird, J. H. Assessing faculty performance: Final project report. Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1976.

Table 1

University of Nebraska at Omaha
Student Evaluation of Teaching Questionnaire

PLEASE READ INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE RECORD ALL RESPONSES ON THE SPECIAL ANSWER SHEET PROVIDED. MAKE NO MARKS ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE USE ONLY A NUMBER 2 (SOFT LEAD) PENCIL FOR RECORDING YOUR RESPONSES.

IN THE BOX AT THE TOP OF THE SPECIAL ANSWER SHEET INDICATE THE INSTRUCTOR'S NAME AND THE CALL NUMBER FOR THE COURSE. DO NOT MAKE ANY MARKS IN THE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER SECTION.

A. CLASSIFICATION INFORMATION

1. INDICATE THE LEVEL OF YOUR PERFORMANCE IN THIS CLASS

   A. BELOW AVERAGE B. AVERAGE C. ABOVE AVERAGE

2. INDICATE ON YOUR ANSWER SHEET WHICH ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CHOICES APPLIES TO YOU:

   A. THIS COURSE IS IN MY MAJOR DEPARTMENT AND SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR MY DEGREE
   B. THIS COURSE IS AN ELECTIVE WITHIN MY DEPARTMENT
   C. THIS COURSE IS OUTSIDE MY MAJOR DEPARTMENT, BUT REQUIRED FOR MY MAJOR
   D. NONE OF THE ABOVE APPLY BUT THIS COURSE IS REQUIRED FOR MEETING GENERAL COLLEGE REQUIREMENTS
   E. THIS COURSE IS A FREELY CHOSEN ELECTIVE

B. EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

EACH ITEM BELOW DEALS WITH A CHARACTERISTIC OF INSTRUCTION WHICH STUDENTS AND/OR FACULTY FEEL TO BE IMPORTANT. RATE EACH ITEM ON THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

A	B	C	D	E
LOWEST RATING "POOR" "NOT AT ALL CHARACTERISTIC"				HIGHEST RATING "EXCELLENT" "VERY CHARACTERISTIC"

IF YOU FEEL THAT THE ITEM OR QUESTION IS INAPPLICABLE TO THIS COURSE, LEAVE THE RESPONSE SECTION BLANK.

3. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR PRESENT THE MATERIAL IN AN INTERESTING WAY?

4. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR ATTEMPT TO ANSWER STUDENT QUESTIONS SATISFACTORILY?

5. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR HAVE THE ABILITY TO EXPLAIN AND CLARIFY SUBJECT MATERIAL?

6. ARE METHODS OF PRESENTATION EMPLOYED WHICH ARE EFFECTIVE IN HELPING YOU LEARN?

7. ARE THE TESTS USED AS A LEARNING DEVICE?

8. HAS THE TEXT BEEN AN EFFECTIVE AID TO LEARNING FOR YOU?

9. ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE CLEAR?

10. ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE REALISTIC?

11. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR STIMULATE THINKING?

12. IS THE INSTRUCTOR ACTIVELY HELPFUL WHEN STUDENTS HAVE DIFFICULTIES?

13. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR MAKE STUDENTS FEEL FREE TO ASK QUESTIONS, DISAGREE, EXPRESS THEIR IDEAS, ETC.

14. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR PRESENT MATERIAL IN A WELL ORGANIZED MANNER?

15. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR SEEM ADEQUATELY PREPARED FOR EACH CLASS?

16. WERE YOU INFORMED OF THE REQUIREMENTS, STANDARDS, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE COURSE?

17. ARE THE TESTS CONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS OF THE COURSE?

18. DOES THE GRADING SYSTEM USED REFLECT A STUDENT'S PROGRESS DURING THE COURSE?

19. CONSIDERING EVERYTHING, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE <u>TEACHING</u> IN THIS COURSE?

20. CONSIDERING EVERYTHING, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS <u>COURSE</u>?

Table 2

U.N.O.
Student Survey on Teacher Evaluations
Spring '77

IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED THIS FORM IN ANOTHER CLASS, PLEASE DO NOT FILL IT OUT AGAIN.

Section I

Use of Student Evaluations

A. In your opinion how are the results of teacher evaluations used? (Check as many as apply)
___ self-improvement by instructors
___ decision-making relative to course selection by students
___ administrative decisions relative to professor's promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases
___ none of the above
___ other:_____
_____

B. Rate the importance which you think each of the following groups places on teacher evaluations. (1 = unimportant 2 = somewhat important 3 = important 4 = moderately important 5 = very important)
___ Faculty
___ Administrators
___ Yourself
___ Other students

C. Did you use the teacher evaluations published by students to help you choose any courses or instructors this semester?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

D. Have you used the published teacher evaluations in making course or instructor selections prior to this semester?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

E. Did you find the format of the published teacher evaluations easily understandable and readable?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

F. Have you ever used the published teacher evaluations after the fact to confirm your personal experience with a particular course or instructor?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

G. If yes, did they include the kind of information you wanted to know?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) somewhat
___ 3) no

H. If yes, did you find them accurate?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

I. Should student government funds be used to publish teacher evaluations?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

J. If funds were limited and copies of published evaluations could not be widely distributed on campus, would you go to one of several central locations such as the library and student center if copies were available there?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

Consideration in Course Decisions

K. What proportion of your class choices this semester were predetermined by your major?
___ 1) 25% or less
___ 2) 26-50%
___ 3) 51-75%
___ 4) 76-100%

L. What proportion of your class choices this semester were predetermined by your work schedule?
___ 1) 25% or less
___ 2) 26-50%
___ 3) 51-75%
___ 4) 76-100%

M. Rank the importance to you for each of the following sources of information in making course decisions this semester. (1 = most important 2 = second most important. . . . .6 = least important)
___ 1) Teacher evaluations
___ 2) Friends' recommendations
___ 3) Faculty recommendations
___ 4) Previous experience with professor
___ 5) Schedule
___ 6) Catalog description of course

Preferred Content and Format

N. If the present teacher evaluation form were redesigned would you prefer a:
___ 1) short form (6-8 questions)
___ 2) medium form (9-20 questions)
___ 3) long form (more than 20 questions)

O. Please rate the importance of each of the following types of information to you in making course decisions. (1 = unimportant 2 = somewhat important 3 = important 4 = moderately important 5 = very important)

___ 1) Class size
___ 2) Student comments about course
___ 3) Professors' professional background
___ 4) Amount and difficulty of work required (e.g., tests, papers, etc.)
___ 5) Teaching strategy used (lecture, discussion, lab, individualized, etc.)
___ 6) Goals of course (factual information, writing skills, personal development, etc.)
___ 7) Instructor-student rapport
___ 8) Instructor's teaching skills
___ 9) Instructor's subject matter knowledge
___10) Fairness of tests and grading scheme
___11) Interesting course content
___12) Instructor's organization and planning of course (degree of structure)
___13) Attendance requirements
___14) Instructor's provision of evaluative feedback about student performance (compliments good work, criticizes poor work)
___15) Instructor's ability to facilitate discussion
___16) Interesting instructor
___17) Instructor's awareness of individual differences
___18) Instructor's availability for individual help
___19) Availability of equipment, facilities, etc.

P. Do you think student responses on teacher evaluation forms should be:

___ 1) students' descriptions of the instructors' behavior and course conduct
___ 2) students' qualitative judgments about instructor and course conduct
___ 3) both of above
___ 4) neither, I don't think students should describe or evaluate instructors or courses

Procedures and Judgments

Q. Do you base your rating on each of the items on the current teacher evaluation form on:

___ 1) an overall impression of the instructor
___ 2) a question by question basis

R. Which one factor is most important in determining your summary rating of an instructor.

___ 1) your grade
___ 2) instructor's knowledge of subject matter
___ 3) interpersonal skills of professor
___ 4) your interest in the subject matter
___ 5) instructor's teaching skills
___ 6) composite or average of all the item ratings on the form

S. How careful are you in making your responses on teacher evaluation forms? (Circle one of the five categories)

Not Careful		Moderately Careful		Very Careful
1	2	3	4	5

T. Have you ever been personally pressured to evaluate a professor positively or negatively against your better judgment?
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

U. If so by whom?
___ 1) other students
___ 2) the professor
___ 3) other faculty
___ 4) other:_____
_____

V. In your ratings, do you distinguish between the instructor and the course? (e.g., Do you ever rate a course positively when you dislike the course?)
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

W. In your experience are the teacher evaluations administered properly (e.g., anonymously, student return forms to Dean, etc.)
___ 1) yes
___ 2) no

Section II

Demographic Information

A-1. Class: (Check appropriate one)
___ 1) Freshman
___ 2) Sophomore
___ 3) Junior
___ 4) Senior
___ 5) Graduate

B-1. Age: (Check appropriate one)
___ 1) under 19
___ 2) 20-23
___ 3) 24-28
___ 4) 29-35
___ 5) 36-40
___ 6) over 40

C-1. Sex:
___ 1) female
___ 2) male

D-1. College: (Check appropriate one)
___ 1) A & S
___ 2) Business Adm.
___ 3) CCS
___ 4) CPACS
___ 5) Education
___ 6) Engineering
___ 7) Fine Arts
___ 8) Graduate
___ 9) Home Economics
___ 10) Undecided
___ 11) University Division

E-1. Number of work hours/week (Check appropriate one)
___ 1) 0
___ 2) 1-10
___ 3) 11-20
___ 4) 21-30
___ 5) 31-40
___ 6) 40+

F-1. Number of semester hours carried this semester (Check appropriate one)
___ 1) 1-3
___ 2) 4-6
___ 3) 7-10
___ 4) 11-14
___ 5) 15 or more

G-1. Cumulative G.P.A. (Check appropriate one)
___ 1) 2.0 or below
___ 2) 2.1-2.4
___ 3) 2.5-2.9
___ 4) 3.0-3.4
___ 5) 3.5-4.0
___ 6) First semester at U.N.O.--no college G.P.A.

H-1. Student status:
___ 1) part-time
___ 2) full-time

Table 3

Survey Return Rates by College and Class*

College	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Total		Response Rate
	Number of Classes		Number of Classes		Number of Classes		Number of Classes		Number of Classes		
	Sampled	Returned	Sampled	Returned	Sampled	Returned	Sampled	Returned	Sampled	Returned	
Arts & Sciences	13	11	6	4	6	5	9	4	34	24	71%
Business Administration	0	0	3	2	4	4	4	1	11	7	64%
CPACS	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	3	75%
Education	2	1	2	1	2	1	5	4	11	7	64%
Fine Arts	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	8	5	63%
Engineering	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	8	6	75%
Home Economics	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	100%
Total	20	16	16	11	17	13	25	14	78	54	69%
Response Rate	75%		69%		76%		56%		69%		

*Random samples stratified proportionally across seven colleges and four class levels was drawn five percent from the U.N.O. Spring 1977 Class Schedule.

Table 4

Summary Results of Student Survey on Teacher Evaluations

Section I

Use of Student Evaluations

A. In your opinion how are the results of teacher evaluations used? (Check as many as apply)

	%
self-improvement by instructors	48
decision-making relative to course selection by students	30
Administrative decisions relative to professor's promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases	37
none of the above	11
other	5

B. Rate the importance which you think each of the following groups places on teacher evaluations. (1 = unimportant and 5 = very important)

	Unimportant - 1	2	3	4	Very important + 5	$\bar{X}$
Faculty	11	31	26	19	13	2.9
Administrators	12	26	26	21	16	3.0
Yourself	23	30	21	14	13	2.7
Other students	22	34	23	13	8	2.5

C. Did you use the teacher evaluations published by students to help you choose any courses or instructors this semester? 6% yes 94% no

D. Have you used the published teacher evaluations in making course or instructor selections prior to this semester? 19% yes 81% no

E. Did you find the format of the published teacher evaluations easily understandable and readable? 59% yes 41% no

F. Have you ever used the published teacher evaluations after the fact to confirm yo - personal experience with a particular course or instructor? 20% yes 80% no

G. If yes, did they include the kind of information you wanted to know? 14% yes 38% no 48% somewhat

H. If yes, did you find them accurate? 43% yes 57% no

I. Should student government funds be used to publish teacher evaluations? 46% yes 54% no

J. If funds were limted and copies of published evaluations could not be widely distributed on campus, would you go to one of the several central locations such as the library and student center if copies were available there? 65% yes 35% no

Consideration in Course Decisions

K. What proportion of your class choices this semester were predetermined by your major?

25% or less	15%
26-50%	14%
51-75%	19%
76-100%	52%

L. What proportion of your class choices this semester were predetermined by your work schedule?

25% or less	46%
26-50%	9%
51-75%	11%
76-100%	34%

M. Rank the importance to you for each of the following sources of information in making course decisions this semester. (1 = most important - 6 = least important)

	most important +		% RANKING			least important -	Median of the Ranks
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Teacher evaluations	3	5	7	9	17	60	5.7
Friend's recommendations	12	23	21	16	11	17	3.2
Faculty recommendations	13	16	16	18	15	21	3.8
Previous experience with professor	20	18	16	12	12	22	3.2
Schedule	52	21	11	7	4	5	1.5
Catalog	13	22	17	13	13	22	3.3

Preferred Content and Format

N. If the present teacher evaluation form were redesigned would you prefer a

short form (6-8 questions)	36%
medium form (9-20 questions)	50%
long form (more than 20 questions)	14%

O. Please rate the importance of each of the following types of information to you in making course decisions. 1 = unimportant - 5 very important

	unimportant -				very important +	$\bar{X}$
	1	2	3	4	5	
Class size	29	24	19	17	9	2.6
Student comments with course	12	22	24	26	16	3.1

O. (continued)	unimportant - 1	2	3	4	very important + 5	$\bar{X}$
Professor's professional background	16	21	28	20	15	3.0
Amount and difficulty of work required (e.g., tests, papers, etc.)	9	20	28	25	18	3.4
Teaching strategy used (lecture, discussion, lab, individualized)	6	13	25	30	25	3.6
Goals of course (factual info, writing skills, personal development, etc.)	5	9	22	27	37	3.9
Instructor-student rapport	7	10	27	26	28	3.6
Instructor's teaching skills	4	6	16	30	44	4.1
Instructor's subject matter knowledge	4	4	15	25	50	4.2
Fairness of tests and grading scheme	4	5	14	26	51	4.2
Interesting course content	4	3	16	30	47	4.2
Instructor's organization and planning of course (degree of structure)	3	8	24	35	28	3.8
Attendance requirements	0	27	22	29	14	2.6
Instructor's provision of evaluative feedback about student performance (compliments good work, criticizes poor work)	9	16	32	25	18	3.3
Instructor's ability to facilitate discussion	5	13	29	31	21	3.5
Interesting instructor	3	6	16	30	44	4.1
Instructor's awareness of individual differences	6	9	24	28	33	3.8
Instructor's availability for individual help	5	10	22	29	32	3.8
Availability of equipment, facilities, etc.	9	15	30	24	21	3.4

P. Do you think student response on teacher evaluation forms should be

	%
student's descriptions of the instructor's behavior and course conduct	11
students' qualitative judgments about instructor and course conduct	22
both of the above	61
neither, I don't think students should describe or evaluate instructors or courses	

Procedures and Judgments

Q. Do you base your rating on each of the items on the current teacher evaluation for on

	%
an overall impression of the instructor	47
a question by question basis	53

R. Which one factor is most important in determining your summary rating of an instructor

	%
your grade	4
instructor's knowledge of subject matter	9
interpersonal skills of professor	5
your interest in the subject matter	6
instructor's teaching skills	38
composite or average of all the item ratings on the form	38

S. How careful are you in making your responses on teacher evaluation forms?

Not Careful		Moderately Careful		Very Careful	$\bar{X}$
1	2	3	4	5	
2%	5%	36%	39%	18%	3.7

T. Have you ever been personally pressured to evaluate a professor positively or negatively against your better judgment? 7% yes 93% no

U. If so by whom?

other students	30%
the professor	40%
other faculty	10%
other	21%

V. In your ratings, do you distinguish between the instructor and the course? (e.g., Do you ever rate a course positively when you dislike the professor? Do you ever rate a professor positively when the dislike the course?)

71% yes 29% no

W. In your experience are the teacher evaluations administered properly (e.g., anonymously, student return forms to Dean, etc.)

85% yes 15% no

Section II

Demographic Information

A-1. Class: (Check appropriate one)

30% 1) Freshman
21% 2) Sophomore
21% 3) Junior
24% 4) Senior
4% 5) Graduate

B-1. Age: (Check appropriate one)
23% 1) under 19
42% 2) 20-23
20% 3) 24-28
10% 4) 29-35
3% 5) 36-40
2% 6) over 40

C-1. Sex:
48% 1) female
52% 2) male

D-1. College: (Check appropriate one)
25% 1) A & S
13% 2) Business Adm.
9% 3) CCS
7% 4) CPACS
20% 5) Education
10% 6) Engineering
5% 7) Fine Arts
2% 8) Graduate
3% 9) Home Economics
2% 10) Undecided
5% 11) University Division

E-1. Number of work hours/week (Check appropriate one)
16% 1) 0
8% 2) 1-10
27% 3) 11-20
20% 4) 21-30
12% 5) 31-40
17% 6) 40%

F-1. Number of semester hours carried this semester (Check appropriate one)
4% 1) 1-3
9% 2) 4-6
12% 3) 7-10
41% 4) 11-14
35% 5) 15 or more

G-1. Cumulative G.P.A. (Check appropriate one)
6% 1) 2.0 or below
13% 2) 2.1-2.4
31% 3) 2.5-2.9
27% 4) 3.0-3.4
20% 5) 3.5-4.0
4% 6) First semester at U.N.O.--no college G.P.A.

H-1. Student status:
26% 1) part-time
74% 2) full-time

Table 6

Some Effects of Class Level on Response Distributions

Item	Response Category	Class Fr.	Soph.	Jr.	Sr.	Statistical Results
A. % of student opinions of how teacher evaluations are used	Course selection by students	23	28	34	36	$\chi^2 = 17.05$, df = 3 ***
	Self-improvement by instructors	60	48	42	48	$\chi^2 = 37.17$, df = 3 ***
D. % of students using evaluations to select courses prior to survey semester	Yes	4	19	26	31	$\chi^2 = 86.34$, df = 3 ***
F. % of students using evaluations to confirm experiences	Yes	8	17	23	31	$\chi^2 = 56.79$, df = 3 ***
J. % of students who would use evaluations in central locations	Yes	29	33	36	40	$\chi^2 = 8.91$, df = 3 *
K. % of students reporting proportions of class choices predetermined by major	25% or less	24	14	10	13	
	26-50%	18	15	17	8	
	51-75%	21	24	19	14	
	76-100%	38	46	55	66	$\chi^2 = 70.67$, df = 9 ***
L. % of students reporting proportions of class choices predetermined by work schedule	25% or less	50	46	44	46	
	26-50%	11	8	12	7	
	51-75%	14	13	12	7	
	76-100%	25	33	33	40	$\chi^2 = 23.28$, df = 9 ***
M. Mean rank of importance of information sources for making class decisions	Teacher evaluations	4.41	5.21	5.16	5.20	$\chi^2 = 18.96$, df = 3 n.s.
V. % of students distinguishing between professor and course in evaluation ratings	Yes	63	70	74	78	$\chi^2 = 17.24$, df = 3 ***

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$